

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings includes changes to and formalization of Figures 1-5 and replaces the original sheets including Figures 1-5.

In Figure 1, a television set coupled to the set-top box 20 is being added. A communication channel coupled to the receiver 22 is being added. Reference numeral 10 is moved to the inside of the large rectangular box representing the DTV system 10.

In Figure 2, transceiver 131 is being added to the gaming console 100.

In Figure 3, lead lines for the reference numerals are being added.

In Figure 4, lead lines for the reference numerals are being added. Block 303 is being removed and the text in blocks 301 and 302 are being amended to conform with the specification.

In Figure 5, lead lines for the reference numerals are being added. The reference numeral 415 that is nearer to the bottom of the figure is being amended to read "405." Reference numeral 306 is being amended to read "406." Block 403 is being removed and the text in blocks 401 and 402 are being amended to conform with the specification.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheets (5 pages)

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were pending as of the office action mailed July 9, 2007.

Replacement sheets with formal, amended Figures 1-5 are being submitted. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in pages 4-6, 8, and 10 of the specification as filed.

Claims 1-2, 5 are being amended. No new matter is being added. Support for the amendment can be found in, for example, pages 7-9 of the specification as filed.

Claims 22-37 are being added.

The specification is being amended. No new matter is being added.

Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

DRAWINGS

The examiner objected to Figures 1 and 2. Replacement Figures 1 and 2 accompany this reply. Replacement Figure 1 amends and formalizes Figure 1 to convey the relationships/connections that are described in the specification. Replacement Figure 2 has been formalized to make the element between 150 and 140 clearer. This objection should be withdrawn.

Additionally, replacement formal, amended Figures 3-5 also accompany this reply. The applicant respectfully requests that the examiner accept the drawings. No new matter is being added.

§ 112 REJECTION

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The term "the at least a storage medium" in the last paragraph of the claim was alleged to lack antecedent basis. Claim 1 is being amended to remove the term "the at least a storage medium." Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

§ 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-2, 5-13, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Yamada (US 6,929,549). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites that the volatile storage medium of the gaming console includes client instruction data related to a gaming client and game instruction data, and further includes set-top client instruction data and set-top application instruction data. The processor of the gaming console is operable to retrieve from the volatile storage medium and to execute the game instruction data and the client instruction data, and the processor is further operable to retrieve the set-top client instruction data and set-top application instruction data from the volatile storage medium and to execute the set-top client instruction data and the set-top application instruction data to extract video information from digital television signals and to display the extracted video information.

Yamada discloses a system with a game machine, a set-top box that is distinct from the game machine, and a TV. Yamada does not disclose that the game machine or a processor thereof is operable to execute set-top instructions to extract video signals from digital satellite broadcast signals and to display the information in the video signals. The functionality of extracting video signals from digital satellite broadcast signals remain with the set-top box. Additionally, Yamada does not disclose that its set-top box or a processor thereof is operable to execute game software; the set-top box downloads and stores the game software and provides the game software to the game machine for execution.

Applicant's claimed gaming console includes a processor that is operable to execute game instructions and to execute set-top instructions to extract and display video information from digital TV signals. The gaming console need not send the game instructions to another machine for execution, and can execute set-top instructions to extract video information.

For at least the reasons stated above, Yamada does not anticipate claim 1. This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above.

Claim 6. Claim 6 recites, in part, receiving first instruction data from an external storage medium read by the console, where the instruction data includes set-top instruction data for receiving and decoding digital broadcast data or communication data for use in retrieving set-top instruction data.

Yamada does not disclose this feature. Yamada does not disclose that the game machine, the set-top box, or the television receiver receives from external storage set-top instruction data or communication data for retrieving the set-top instruction data. The game machine in Yamada can receive game software from the set-top box, but Yamada does not disclose that the game machine can receive set-top instruction data for decoding digital broadcast signals or communication data for retrieving set-top instruction data. In Yamada, the digital broadcast signal decoding functionality is not associated with the game console. Thus, Yamada does not anticipate claim 6. This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 7-20 depend from claim 6, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 3-4, 14, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yamada. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The rejected claims depend from claim 1 or claim 6. As stated above, Yamada does not teach all limitations of claim 1 or of claim 6. The examiner has not shown that the limitations not taught by Yamada are within ordinary skill in the art. Thus, the examiner failed to make a prima facie case that the claims are obvious over Yamada.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability

Applicant : Daniel Willis
Serial No. : 10/775,195
Filed : February 11, 2004
Page : 16 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-0687001 / GP-1090-04-US-CIP

of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

The fee in the amount of \$1220 (\$800 for excess claim fees and \$420 for independent claims in excess of three) are being paid concurrently herewith with the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account Authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 16113-0687001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9 January 2008

Andrew Leung
Andrew H. Leung
Reg. No. 55,374

Customer No. 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071